

in this issue . . .

	Page
EDITORIALS: 1. INKATHA	2
2. PERSECUTION AND TERRORISM	3
DIVIDED WE STAND, UNITED WE FALL by Peter Rutsch	4
FOR AFRICAN WOMEN EQUAL RIGHTS ARE NOT ENOUGH by Thelma Awori	5
NUSAS by Edgar Brookes	8
LEGAL DISABILITIES OF ZULU WOMEN PART II by M. L. Lupton	9
Mr VORSTER AND THE WHITE BACKLASH by Jan van Eck	11
RELIGION AND PREJUDICE, A REVIEW by Colin Gardner	13
INKATHA—EXTRACTS FROM SPEECH by Chief M. G. Buthelezi	14
DIAKONIA	18
POEM by Chris Mann	19
THE MOFOLO—PLOMER PRIZE	20
COVER AND ILLUSTRATIONS by Daryl Nero	

EDITORIALS

INKATHA

The last issue of Reality included an article on Inkatha the Zulu-based "National Cultural Liberation Movement". Founded with fairly modest aims by King Solomon kaDinuzulu in 1928, Inkatha lay dormant for many years until it was revived earlier this year, and then formally launched on a new and ambitious course at a widely representative gathering of Zulu people at Bhekuzulu College, KwaZulu, in July. In this issue we publish extracts from Chief Gatsha Buthelezi's address on that occasion. In our next issue we hope to have another article on Inkatha—and no doubt in the future there will be others. We make no apology for this. Inkatha is new, we think it is important, and we also think it is going to be controversial.

Inkatha, as it is at present, is an entirely Zulu organisation, and it represents an entirely new approach to the problems of our society. Of all the African groups in South Africa the Zulu people have been the most reluctant to participate in the apartheid game. They were almost the last to join the Bantu Authorities system; did so only under extreme pressure and have spent a large part of their time since then saying

how much they dislike what they are having to do. The trouble is that once you are caught up in the apartheid system, you can criticise it as much as you like, but you are, in the day-to-day management of 'homeland' affairs, for example, largely obliged to operate within its limits. You cannot do anything about the pass laws, or job reservation or the medium of instruction in schools, you can only hope to push Pretoria into doing what you would like done. The frustrations must be endless. There is another side, too, to participation in separate development, this is the danger of eventually thinking that its institutions are more important than they are; of overrating their effectiveness as levers for change towards an open society. It is against this background that Inkatha must be assessed.

The KwaZulu Legislative Assembly, a creation of apartheid, has, through reviving Inkatha, set up a Zulu national organisation operating outside Pretoria's control, answerable only to its own members, intended to influence the actions of the ZLA, and rejecting the apartheid policies of which that Assembly is an integral part. It is an interesting situation.

While continuing to operate the machinery of apartheid the ZLA has established, outside that machinery, a movement which rejects apartheid and by whose views, it seems, its own actions will be guided. Inkatha, it appears, will be the Assembly's self-appointed watchdog, reminding it, whenever necessary, that its obligations are as much to the people outside its own homeland as they are to those living in it.

The Aims and Objectives of Inkatha, as set out in its constitution, show clearly its Zulu origins, but show equally clearly the direction in which it wants to go. Thus, for example, the first aim is "to foster the spirit of unity among the people of KwaZulu throughout Southern Africa and between them and all their African brothers in Southern Africa and to keep alive and foster the traditions of the people", while the second is "to help promote and encourage the development of the people of KwaZulu, spiritually, economically, educationally and politically". But amongst its other aims is one "to establish contact and liaise with other cultural groups in Southern Africa with a view to the establishment of a common society", and another "to abolish all forms of discrimination and segregation based on tribe, clan, sex, colour or creed." The intention, then, is to use a Zulu organisation to press for the establishment of a non-racial, common South African society. For that goal to be attained the leaders of Inkatha are obviously going to have to keep it very much before their supporters. It is easy enough to whip up group enthusiasm for a group cause but not nearly so easy to carry that

enthusiasm over group divisions to embrace people who are in some way different from yourselves.

There is another point. As Dr Bengu pointed out in his article Inkatha does not feel itself bound to the Western Party political system and intends investigating fully the relevance of indigenous African democratic systems to our situation. Presumably he is referring to the "consensus" politics of African tribal society. We think such an investigation could be most valuable. The rigidities of the present party system, with members bound by secret caucus decisions, need very critical examination. But we also have a concern about the application of consensus politics to our situation and that concern is for the dissident voice. Will it be heard? Would, for instance, the voice of SASO and BPC ever be heard? Their members may say a great many things which we find unacceptable but that they are brave and thinking members of our society with ideas that the rest of us should know about, we have no doubt. Though they will reject Inkatha, we hope that it will not reject them, that due allowance will be made in its development for all dissident voices to be heard.

Reality will watch the progress of Inkatha with the greatest interest, and will hope that it will soon grow from a purely Zulu organisation into one in which any person committed to the ideal of the common society to which it subscribes will be welcome and able to make a contribution. □

PERSECUTION AND TERRORISM

Dr Monty Naicker, former President of the South African Indian Congress, is 65 years old. For one quarter of his life (16 years) he has been banned. When the most recent of his bans expired three years ago he and his wife applied for passports, hoping, one suspects, to be able to get away for a while from the suffocating restrictions of apartheid. They were refused, as they have been twice since then, most recently this September, when they hoped to have a holiday in Mauritius. Is this not vindictive persecution?

On or about September 23rd Mr Lindeliwe Mabandla and his wife Brigitte, both of Durban, were served with three-year banning orders and banished to the tiny Transkei town of Tsolo, where they are not likely to find work. On or about the same date Mr Mapetlo Mohapi was also banned and banished, in his case to the Zwelitsha and Kingwilliams-town districts of the Eastern Cape, and Mr Steven Carolus of Cape Town was also banned. All four have a common history. They were associated with SASO, were detained for between five and six months each at the time of last year's

Frelimo rallies, and were released at the end of these periods without charge. Presumably they were only released because their prolonged secret detention and interrogation failed to produce evidence that they had committed a crime. One must assume that they have been banned and banished because there is no evidence of the commission of a crime. After the terror of detention comes the persecution of banning and banishment.

Of the many people detained at the time of the Frelimo rallies last year thirteen eventually appeared in court some six months later. The charges were thrown out by the court. Two of the thirteen were then released, two had their cases separated from the others and, a year after their detention, are still waiting for their trials to commence, the other nine are appearing on newly-framed charges before the court in Pretoria. Recently they celebrated the first anniversary of their detention by producing a cake in the court and asking the embarrassed State prosecutor to blow out the candle! A symbolic act; for the Terrorism Act under which the